

*Reges v. Cauce, et al.,*

# **Exhibit A**

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
SEATTLE DIVISION

STUART REGES,  
*Plaintiff,*

v.

ANA MARI CAUCE, in her official  
capacity as President of the University  
of Washington;

MAGDALENA BALAZINSKA, in her  
official and individual capacities as  
Director of the Paul G. Allen School of  
Computer Science & Engineering;

DAN GROSSMAN, in his official and  
individual capacities as Vice Director of  
the Paul G. Allen School of Computer  
Science & Engineering; and

NANCY ALLBRITTON, in her official  
and individual capacities as Dean of  
the College of Engineering,  
*Defendants.*

~~Civil Action No.:~~ \_\_\_\_\_

CASE NO. 2:22-cv-00964-JHC

**AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR  
CIVIL RIGHTS VIOLATIONS**

JURY DEMAND

JAMES M. DIAZ\*  
VT Bar No. 5014  
FOUNDATION FOR INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS  
AND EXPRESSION  
510 Walnut Street  
Suite 1250  
Philadelphia, PA 19106  
Tel: (215) 717-3473  
jay.diaz@thefire.org

ROBERT A. BOUVATTE, JR.  
WA Bar No. 50220  
ROBERT A. BOUVATTE, PLLC  
P.O. Box 14185  
Tumwater, WA 98511  
Tel: ~~(904) 505-3175~~ 564) 999-4005  
bob@rbouvattepllc.com

GABRIEL WALTERS\*  
DC Bar No. 1019272  
JOSHUA T. BLEISCH\*  
IN Bar No. 35859-53  
~~GABRIEL WALTERS\*~~  
~~DC Bar No. 1019272~~  
FOUNDATION FOR INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS  
AND EXPRESSION  
700 Pennsylvania Avenue SE  
Suite 340  
Washington, DC 20003  
Tel: (215) 717-3473  
~~josh.bleisch@thefire.org~~  
gabe.walters@thefire.org

\*josh.bleisch@thefire.org

\*Admitted Pro Hac Vice ~~Motions~~  
~~Forthcoming~~

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page(s)</u>
INTRODUCTION .....	11
JURISDICTION AND VENUE .....	5
THE PARTIES .....	6
FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS .....	88
Professor Reges Challenges the University of Washington’s Prescribed Land Acknowledgment Statement in His Syllabus.....	9
Defendants Punish Professor Reges for His Use of the Dissenting Land Acknowledgment Statement. ....	12
<u>Defendants Continue to Threaten Professor Reges with     Disciplinary Action for His Inclusion of the Dissenting Land     Acknowledgment Statement in His Syllabus. ....</u>	<u>20</u>
<u>Defendants Withheld Professor Reges’s 2022–23 Salary Increase     During the Pendency of Their Disciplinary Process Against Him. ....</u>	<u>22</u>
Defendants’ Actions Deprived Professor Reges of His Rights, Causing <u>Financial</u> , Emotional, and Reputational Damage. ....	2323
FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION	
Violation of Plaintiff’s First Amendment Rights (Against All Individual-Capacity Defendants) .....	25
SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION	
First Amendment Retaliation Under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (Against All Individual-Capacity Defendants) .....	29
THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION	
First Amendment Retaliation Under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (Against All Defendants in Their Official Capacities) .....	31
FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION	
Facial Overbreadth Challenge to Executive Order 31 (Against President Cauce in Her Official Capacity) .....	32

AMENDED

COMPLAINT – Page iii

FOUNDATION FOR INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS AND EXPRESSION  
~~700 Pennsylvania Ave. SE~~ 510 Walnut Street, Suite ~~340~~ 1250  
Washington, DC 20003  
Philadelphia, PA 19106  
 Tel: (215) 717-3473

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Facial Vagueness Challenge to Executive Order 31  
(Against President Cauce in Her Official Capacity) .....35

PRAYER FOR RELIEF .....37

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL .....3838

AMENDED

COMPLAINT – Page iii

FOUNDATION FOR INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS AND EXPRESSION  
~~700 Pennsylvania Ave. SE~~ 510 Walnut Street, Suite ~~340~~ 1250  
~~Washington, DC 20003~~  
Philadelphia, PA 19106  
Tel: (215) 717-3473

## INTRODUCTION

1. Stuart Reges, an award-winning educator at the University of Washington, is suing the University of Washington and its administrators to vindicate his well-established First Amendment rights. After the University encouraged professors to include a political statement on their course syllabi, it disciplined and ~~continues to investigate~~investigated Professor Reges and continues to threaten him with further discipline for expressing a dissenting view.

2. In September 2020, University administrators encouraged professors to include a statement on their syllabi recognizing that the land on which the University sits was once owned by indigenous people. Professor Reges disagreed with the University's "Indigenous Land Acknowledgment Statement."

3. Because syllabi are an integral part of the teaching and construction of a college course, Professor Reges included a dissenting statement on his syllabus which challenged his students and fellow faculty to think about the utility and performative nature of land acknowledgment statements. To that end, Professor Reges's land acknowledgment stated that indigenous tribes "can claim historical ownership of almost none of the land" on which the University sits, based on philosopher John Locke's well-known labor theory of property, under which ownership derives from improving the land.

4. University administrators punished Professor Reges for his statement, asserting that it caused a "disruption to instruction." To the contrary, Professor Reges reviewed his syllabus on the first day of class without incident.

AMENDED

COMPLAINT – Page 1

FOUNDATION FOR INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS AND EXPRESSION  
~~700 Pennsylvania Ave. SE~~510 Walnut Street, Suite ~~340~~1250  
~~Washington, DC 20003~~  
Philadelphia, PA 19106  
 Tel: (215) 717-3473

1           5.       The University created a “shadow” class section of Professor Reges’s  
2 computer programming course—taught by a different professor, on tape—and  
3 invited students to switch out of Professor Reges’s class section.

4           6.       Meanwhile, other computer science professors included their own land  
5 acknowledgment statements on their syllabi. But the University did not investigate  
6 or punish them because those statements, unlike that of Professor Reges, were  
7 consistent with the University’s viewpoint.

8           7. In addition, the University opened a protracted disciplinary  
9 investigation into Professor Reges—~~which remains ongoing~~—in which the  
10 Defendants ~~are currently assembling~~assembled a disciplinary committee to  
11 ~~consider~~investigate and advise Dean Albritton in deciding whether to further  
12 punish or even terminate Professor Reges because of the views he expressed in his  
13 dissenting statement. ~~The specter of termination has had a chilling effect on his~~

14           7.8. After a nearly year-long disciplinary investigation, Dean Albritton  
15 concluded that she would not further punish Professor Reges at that time. However,  
16 she warned him that if he continues to include his land acknowledgment in his  
17 course syllabi, and it leads to “further” disruption, she would punish him. She  
18 warned him that she would “have no option but to conclude” that his “intent is to  
19 cause deliberate offense” and that she would “view that as an intentional violation”  
20 of the University’s discrimination and harassment policy. This ongoing specter of  
21 punishment, up to and including termination, had and continues to have a chilling  
22 effect on Reges’s speech as a public university faculty member.

1       ~~8.~~9. The University has taken these actions despite settled law that holds  
 2 public university faculty have a First Amendment right to speak on matters of  
 3 public concern in their teaching and research because academic freedom is “a  
 4 special concern of the First Amendment[.]” *Keyishian v. Bd. of Regents*, 385 U.S.  
 5 589, 603 (1967). Faculty must remain free to express these views to fulfill their  
 6 duties to educate and challenge students, and to avoid a “pall of orthodoxy” on  
 7 campus. *Id.*

8       ~~9.~~10. The value and utility of land ~~acknowledgement~~acknowledgment  
 9 statements ~~exemplifies~~exemplify such a matter of public debate. Defendants asked  
 10 their faculty to wade into this controversy by including a land acknowledgment  
 11 statement in their syllabi, then unconstitutionally discriminated against Professor  
 12 Reges for swimming against the current and offering a dissenting viewpoint. They  
 13 did so by retaliating against him through the creation of a “shadow” class section  
 14 and subjecting him to a disciplinary investigation under vague and overbroad  
 15 university policies.

16       ~~10.~~11. Specifically, Defendants alleged Reges violated various University  
 17 policies, including one that purports to ban any speech or conduct that is deemed  
 18 “unacceptable or inappropriate,” regardless of whether it rises to the level of unlaw-  
 19 ful discrimination or harassment. Judged in relation to its legitimate sweep, which  
 20 is minimal, this policy is unconstitutionally overbroad and vague.



1 ~~11~~12. Academic freedom is of “transcendent value” to our constitutional  
 2 tradition. *Id.* To safeguard that value, faculty like Professor Reges must remain free  
 3 to express their views without retaliation or censorship.

#### 4 JURISDICTION AND VENUE

5 ~~12~~13. This action arises under the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the  
 6 United States Constitution; the Civil Rights Act of 1871, 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983 and  
 7 1988; and the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201–02.

8 ~~13~~14. Plaintiff seeks declaratory and injunctive relief against Defendants in  
 9 their official capacities, including a ruling that Defendants are retaliating against  
 10 him for protected academic speech in violation of his First Amendment rights.

11 Plaintiff also seeks to enjoin ~~Defendants'~~Defendants from pursuing any disciplinary  
 12 action based on his use of a dissenting land acknowledgment statement in his  
 13 syllabus and from enforcing the University's unconstitutionally vague and  
 14 overbroad policy governing faculty expression. Finally, Plaintiff seeks compensatory  
 15 damages against Defendants Director Balazinska, Vice Director Grossman, and  
 16 Dean Allbritton in their individual capacities for violating his clearly established  
 17 right to speak freely in his teaching and academic writing.

18 ~~14~~15. Accordingly, this Court has jurisdiction over these federal claims under  
 19 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1343.

20 ~~15~~16. Venue is proper in this judicial district under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1)  
 21 because at least one of the Defendants resides in this District, and because all  
 22 Defendants are residents of the State of Washington.

1 ~~16~~17. Venue is also proper in this district under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2)  
 2 because a substantial part of the events giving rise to Professor Reges's claims  
 3 occurred in King County, Washington, which is located in the Seattle Division of the  
 4 Western District of Washington.

## 5 THE PARTIES

### 6 Plaintiff

7 ~~17~~18. Plaintiff Stuart Reges is a citizen of the United States and a resident of  
 8 Seattle, Washington.

9 ~~18~~19. For the last four decades, Professor Reges has focused on introductory  
 10 instruction in computer science and programming, developing and running  
 11 introductory programs at several universities.

12 ~~19~~20. Since 2004, Professor Reges has been a faculty member at the  
 13 University of Washington in the Paul G. Allen School of Computer Science &  
 14 Engineering (Allen School).

15 ~~20~~21. In addition to being an acclaimed teacher, Professor Reges has a long  
 16 history as an advocate for free speech, especially for the right to express dissenting  
 17 viewpoints. He has spoken publicly in local and national media about his struggle  
 18 with identity and mental health as a gay man in the 1970s and 1980s. And when he  
 19 was a professor at Stanford University in the early 1990s, he publicly criticized the  
 20 War on Drugs. Stanford responded to this criticism by firing him.

21 ~~21~~22. At all times relevant to this Complaint, the University of Washington  
 22 employed Reges as a Principal Lecturer, or Teaching Professor, in the Allen School.

23 AMENDED

COMPLAINT – Page 6

FOUNDATION FOR INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS AND EXPRESSION  
~~700 Pennsylvania Ave. SE~~ 510 Walnut Street, Suite ~~340~~1250  
~~Washington, DC 20003~~  
Philadelphia, PA 19106  
 Tel: (215) 717-3473

~~22-23.~~ Professor Reges is suing in order to vindicate his constitutional rights.

## Defendants

~~23-24.~~ Defendant Ana Mari Cauce is the President of the University of Washington “authorized to act for the Board of Regents in formulating, prescribing and issuing rules, regulations, and executive orders not inconsistent with the Bylaws, Standing Orders, Regent Policies, and other orders of the Board and applicable state law for the immediate government of the University.” Bd. of Regents Governance, Ch. 1. Defendant Cauce has been President of the University of Washington since 2015. Twice during her tenure (in July of 2016 and August of 2020) she renewed “Executive Order 31,” the source of the University’s authority to impose disciplinary or corrective action for conduct deemed “unacceptable” or “inappropriate.” She is sued in her official capacity.

~~24-25.~~ Defendant Magdalena Balazinska is the Director of the Paul G. Allen School of Computer Science & Engineering at the University of Washington. She ordered Professor Reges to remove his land acknowledgment statement from his syllabus; created a “shadow” class section that met at the same time as Professor Reges’s class; and ~~is continuing to investigate~~ initiated the disciplinary investigation of Professor Reges for his statement, all in violation of his constitutional rights. She is sued in both her official and individual capacities.

~~25-26.~~ Defendant Dan Grossman is the Vice Director of the Paul G. Allen School of Computer Science & Engineering at the University of Washington. By participating in Professor Reges’s first disciplinary meeting, creating a “shadow”

AMENDED

COMPLAINT – Page 7

FOUNDATION FOR INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS AND EXPRESSION  
~~700 Pennsylvania Ave. SE~~ 510 Walnut Street, Suite ~~340~~ 1250  
~~Washington, DC 20003~~  
Philadelphia, PA 19106  
 Tel: (215) 717-3473

1 class section that met at the same time as Professor Reges's class, and assisting in  
 2 the ~~ongoing~~disciplinary investigation into Professor Reges, Vice Director Grossman  
 3 is responsible for violating Professor Reges's constitutional rights. He is sued in  
 4 both his official and individual capacities.

5 ~~26-27.~~ Defendant Nancy Allbritton is the Dean of the College of Engineering  
 6 at the University of Washington. ~~She is charging~~She oversees the Allen School,  
 7 which is situated within the College of Engineering. She charged Professor Reges  
 8 with a disciplinary violation under Faculty Code Section 25-71, which governs  
 9 alleged violations of University policy and empowers the Dean to file formal  
 10 statements of charges that can lead to dismissal, reduction of salary, or suspension.  
 11 Dean Allbritton ~~is also assembling~~assembled a faculty disciplinary committee that  
 12 ~~will review~~reviewed those charges. Upon conclusion of the committee's review, Dean  
 13 Allbritton warned Professor Reges that if he continued to include his dissenting  
 14 land acknowledgment statement in his course syllabi and it causes what she deems  
 15 "further" disruption, she would conclude he intentionally violated University  
 16 discrimination and harassment policy. She is sued in both her official and  
 17 individual capacities.

## 18 FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

19 ~~27-28.~~ In 2011, the University of Washington awarded Professor Reges the  
 20 Distinguished Teaching Award, given to only seven professors each year based on  
 21 their subject matter expertise; enthusiasm and innovation in teaching and learning;

“ability to inspire independent and original thinking in students”; innovations in course and curriculum design; and mentoring.

~~28~~29. Professor Reges regularly receives very positive reviews from his students.

***Professor Reges Challenges the University of Washington’s Prescribed Land Acknowledgment Statement in His Syllabus.***

~~29~~30. In a document called the “Allen School best practices for inclusive teaching,” the Allen School suggests professors “make [their] course syllabus more inclusive” by including an “Indigenous Land Acknowledgment Statement.”

~~30~~31. The Allen School recommends that professors include the following “example” land acknowledgment statement: “The University of Washington acknowledges the Coast Salish peoples of this land, the land which touches the shared waters of all tribes and bands within the Suquamish, Tulalip and Muckleshoot nations.”

~~31~~32. The University Office of Minority Affairs and Diversity’s webpage states that the University’s Tribal Liaison developed the land ~~acknowledgement~~acknowledgment statement “over the course of several years” and that among other uses it “is spoken by [University] leadership during events to acknowledge” the view “that our campus sits on occupied land.”

~~32~~33. On December 8, 2021, a faculty member emailed an article titled *Land Acknowledgments’ Are Just Moral Exhibitionism* to the Allen School’s “diversity-allies” listserv.

1 ~~33~~34. Professor Reges replied to the email stating he had been “thinking a lot  
2 about land acknowledgments” and offering to organize a group discussion on the  
3 topic. He also shared the land acknowledgment statement he intended to include in  
4 his syllabus for his upcoming Winter quarter 2022 class: “I acknowledge that by the  
5 labor theory of property the Coast Salish people can claim historical ownership of  
6 almost none of the land currently occupied by the University of Washington.”

7 ~~34~~35. Subsequently, Professor Reges included this land acknowledgment  
8 statement on the syllabus for his Computer Science and Engineering 143: Computer  
9 Programming II class, which the Allen School assigned him to teach during the  
10 Winter 2022 quarter.

11 ~~35~~36. Other computer science professors also included modified land  
12 acknowledgment statements on their syllabi. These statements were consistent  
13 with, but not always identical to, the Allen School’s recommended statement.

14 ~~36~~37. On January 4, 2022, the day after Professor Reges’s Computer Science  
15 and Engineering 143 class met for the first time, Defendant Balazinska, Director of  
16 the Allen School, sent Professor Reges an email ordering him to remove the  
17 statement from his syllabus because it was “offensive” and created a “toxic  
18 environment.”

19 ~~37~~38. In his reply email, Professor Reges refused to remove the statement,  
20 and questioned why the Allen School was ordering him to delete his dissenting land  
21 acknowledgment statement from his syllabus while allowing other faculty to include

1 modified statements in their syllabi that were more consistent with the University's  
2 recommended statement.

3 ~~38.39.~~ Director Balazinska responded to Professor Reges by stating she would  
4 "ask any instructor who uses a land acknowledgment other than the [University of  
5 Washington] land acknowledgment to remove or replace it."

6 ~~39.40.~~ Director Balazinska then unilaterally removed Professor Reges's  
7 dissenting land acknowledgment statement from the syllabus as it appeared on the  
8 University's class portal, an online site where students can find syllabi, class  
9 materials, and assignments.

10 ~~40.41.~~ Director Balazinska also emailed Professor Reges's students to  
11 apologize for his "offensive" statement, and to provide three ways students could file  
12 complaints against Professor Reges.

13 ~~41.42.~~ Despite Director Balazinska's response, other faculty at the Allen  
14 School continue to include land acknowledgment statements in their syllabi that  
15 differ from the University's own statement, so long as they express a viewpoint  
16 consistent with the University's recommended version.

17 ~~42.43.~~ Thus, professors who agree with the University's viewpoint are free to  
18 include or to modify the recommended land ~~acknowledgement~~acknowledgment  
19 statement, but faculty like Professor Reges who express a dissenting viewpoint are  
20 not.

21 ~~43.44.~~ In her email response, Director Balazinska also claimed that Professor  
22 Reges's syllabus was "causing a disruption to instruction in [his] class."

23 AMENDED

COMPLAINT – Page 11

FOUNDATION FOR INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS AND EXPRESSION

~~700 Pennsylvania Ave. SE~~ 510 Walnut Street, Suite ~~340~~1250

~~Washington, DC 20003~~

Philadelphia, PA 19106

Tel: (215) 717-3473

1 ~~44.~~45. Director Balazinska did not provide Professor Reges any examples of  
2 disruption to instruction in his class.

3 ~~45.~~46. In fact, no actual disruption of Professor Reges's class occurred.  
4 Professor Reges taught his first class of the Winter quarter on January 3, 2022,  
5 without incident and continued to teach nearly 400 students through the end of the  
6 quarter on March 18, 2022.

7 ~~46.~~47. During the Winter 2022 quarter, Professor Reges also helped to mentor  
8 a group of students who won a computer programming contest for the first time in  
9 several years.

10 ***Defendants Punish Professor Reges for His Use of the Dissenting Land***  
11 ***Acknowledgment Statement.***

12 48. On January 4, 2022, Defendant Balazinska sought to initiate a  
13 disciplinary process against Professor Reges under Faculty Code Section 25-71,  
14 which establishes a procedure for disciplining faculty following an allegation that  
15 the faculty member has violated University policy. This procedure "might lead to  
16 dismissal, reduction of salary, or suspension for more than one quarter." Defendant  
17 Balazinska contacted the University of Washington College of Engineering senior  
18 director of human resources to determine next steps if Professor Reges did not agree  
19 to remove his dissenting statement from his syllabus. In response, the senior  
20 director of human resources prepared a draft notification letter under Section 25-71  
21 that day alleging that Professor Reges had violated multiple University policies.



1 ~~47.~~49. On January 7, 2022, Director Balazinska announced to all students in  
 2 Professor Reges's Computer Science and Engineering 143 class section that they  
 3 may switch into a new "shadow" class section, which would meet at the same time  
 4 as Professor Reges's class section.

5 ~~48.~~50. The Allen School assigned a different professor to instruct this  
 6 "shadow" class section. During the Winter 2022 quarter, that professor instructed  
 7 the class using recorded lectures instead of live class sessions.

8 ~~49.~~51. In a January 9, 2022, email to a news network, Director Balazinska  
 9 criticized Professor Reges's "invocation of Locke's labor theory of property" in his  
 10 syllabus on the asserted ground that it "dehumanizes and demeans Indigenous  
 11 people." Jason Rantz, *Rantz: UW administrator goes to war over Seattle professor's*  
 12 *hilarious land acknowledgment joke*, KTTH (Jan. 9, 2022), [https://mynorthwest.com](https://mynorthwest.com/3301858/rantz-uw-admin-war-seattle-professors-land-joke/)  
 13 [/3301858/rantz-uw-admin-war-seattle-professors-land-joke/](https://mynorthwest.com/3301858/rantz-uw-admin-war-seattle-professors-land-joke/) [[https://perma.cc/EKP9-](https://perma.cc/EKP9-A4L4)  
 14 [A4L4](https://perma.cc/EKP9-A4L4)].

15 ~~50.~~52. Defendant Balazinska created the "shadow" Computer Science and  
 16 Engineering 143 class section to punish Professor Reges for including his land  
 17 acknowledgment statement in his syllabus.

18 ~~51.~~53. Approximately 170 students out of over 500 students (or around 30% of  
 19 Professor Reges's class) switched to the new "shadow" class section.

20 ~~52.~~54. Professor Reges continued teaching the other 70% of his students who  
 21 remained in his class through the end of the Winter 2022 quarter without

1 disruption or any other issues. He successfully administered the final exam and  
2 distributed grades.

3 ~~53-55.~~ On January 11, 2022, the Foundation for Individual Rights and  
4 Expression (FIRE)<sup>1</sup> sent President Cauce a letter urging the University to ensure  
5 that faculty are free to decide whether and how to address the topic of land  
6 acknowledgments in their syllabi and making clear that punishing faculty for  
7 differing viewpoints by investigating them and creating new course sections violates  
8 the First Amendment.

9 56. Despite a flurry of edits and comments, by some point in January or  
10 February 2022, Defendant Balazinska chose not to finalize or send the draft version  
11 of the January 2022 25-71 letter, believing that the matter had been resolved by the  
12 creation of the “shadow” section of Computer Science and Engineering 143. She  
13 would revisit that decision after February 23, 2022.

14 ~~54-57.~~ On February 23, 2022, Professor Reges sent an email to the Allen  
15 School’s “diversity-allies” listserv, which is available to all students and faculty in  
16 the Allen School, in which he expressed his intent to again include his own version  
17 of a land acknowledgment statement on his Spring quarter syllabus.

18 ~~55-58.~~ University administrators monitor the Allen School’s “diversity-allies”  
19 listserv and review incoming messages before they are distributed to recipients.

---

22 <sup>1</sup> Formerly known as the Foundation for Individual Rights in Education, FIRE has since  
expanded its mission to include protecting expressive rights outside of higher education.

~~56-59. University administrators~~ Defendant Balazinska reviewed Professor Reges's February 23, 2022, email and allowed it to pass through to the Allen School's "diversity-allies" listserv.

~~57-60.~~ On March 2, 2022, Director Balazinska sent Professor Reges a notice letter under Faculty Code Section 25-71 that called him to a meeting to discuss allegations that "may, if true, constitute a violation of" several University policies, including University of Washington Executive Order 31.

~~58-61.~~ Executive Order 31 provides "the University retains the authority to discipline or take appropriate corrective action for any conduct that is deemed unacceptable or inappropriate, regardless of whether the conduct rises to the level of unlawful discrimination, harassment, or retaliation."

~~59-62.~~ Executive Order 31 applies to all members of the University of Washington community, including academic personnel and students.

~~60-63.~~ The notice letter cited three broad allegations against Reges, ~~ostensibly from University students, all~~ relating to his land acknowledgment statement. The letter cited: (1) Professor Reges's land ~~acknowledgement~~ acknowledgment statement; (2) Professor Reges's email to the "diversity-allies" listserv that included his land acknowledgment statement; and (3) an allegation from representatives of the student employee union that his actions violated their collective bargaining agreement with the University.

~~61-64.~~ On March 8, 2022, Professor Reges met with Defendants Director Balazinska and Vice Director Dan Grossman.

AMENDED

COMPLAINT – Page 15

FOUNDATION FOR INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS AND EXPRESSION  
~~700 Pennsylvania Ave. SE~~ 510 Walnut Street, Suite ~~340~~ 1250  
~~Washington, DC 20003~~  
Philadelphia, PA 19106  
 Tel: (215) 717-3473

1 ~~62-65~~. During the March 8 meeting, Director Balazinska informed Professor  
 2 Reges of the allegations against him and that she expected faculty to “interact  
 3 respectfully” and create a “welcoming,” “professional,” and “positive” environment.

4 ~~63-66~~. At that meeting, Director Balazinska also said if Professor Reges  
 5 continued to use his land acknowledgment statement, she expected to receive more  
 6 complaints, and she considered those complaints to be a disruption to the delivery of  
 7 instruction.

8 ~~64-67~~. During the meeting, Professor Reges also asked Director Balazinska to  
 9 confirm that he would not be in violation of University policy if he included the  
 10 University’s *own* land acknowledgment on future syllabi. Director Balazinska could  
 11 not confirm this.

12 ~~65-68~~. Director Balazinska also indicated that if students were to complain  
 13 about him including the University’s land acknowledgment statement on his  
 14 syllabus, Professor Reges may be in violation of University policy.

15 ~~66-69~~. Director Balazinska also could not confirm whether any of Professor  
 16 Reges’s students submitted the complaints, or whether they originated from other  
 17 University students who heard about the controversy.

18 ~~67-70~~. On March 9, 2022, Director Balazinska provided Professor Reges with  
 19 a proposed resolution to the charges against him, which is the first step to resolving  
 20 alleged faculty policy violations under University of Washington Faculty Code 25-  
 21 71.B. The proposed resolution would have required Reges to, among other things,  
 22 “interact with peers, staff, and students in a way that demonstrates respect toward

23 AMENDED

COMPLAINT – Page 16

FOUNDATION FOR INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS AND EXPRESSION  
~~700 Pennsylvania Ave. SE~~ 510 Walnut Street, Suite ~~340~~ 1250  
~~Washington, DC 20003~~  
Philadelphia, PA 19106  
 Tel: (215) 717-3473

1 all” and “create[] and maintain[] a professional, positive, and welcoming  
2 environment.”

3 ~~68-71~~. The proposed resolution Director Balazinska provided would also  
4 require Professor Reges to “agree not to include . . . [his] version of the land  
5 acknowledgment that was published in the [Computer Science and Engineering]  
6 143 Winter 2022 online course syllabus in . . . future course syllabi.”

7 ~~69-72~~. Reges declined the proposed resolution the next day.

8 ~~70-73~~. On March 18, 2022, Nancy Allbritton, Dean of the University of  
9 Washington College of Engineering, emailed Professor Reges to set up a meeting  
10 “pursuant to [Faculty Code] Section 25-71.D,” which is the second step in the faculty  
11 disciplinary process.

12 ~~71-74~~. University Faculty Code Section 25-71.D governs “alleged violation[s]”  
13 of University policy and empowers the Dean to determine whether “the alleged  
14 violation is of sufficient seriousness to justify consideration of the filing of a formal  
15 statement of charges that might lead to dismissal, reduction of salary, or suspension  
16 for more than one quarter.”

17 ~~72-75~~. On March 25, 2022, Professor Reges, represented by FIRE Staff  
18 Attorney Katlyn Patton, met with Dean Allbritton as part of the second step in the  
19 faculty disciplinary process.

20 ~~73-76~~. At the March 25, 2022, disciplinary meeting, Dean Allbritton asked  
21 Reges to speculate as to how students felt about his land acknowledgment

1 statement, and why the students who moved into the “shadow” class section chose  
2 to do so.

3 ~~74.~~77. Professor Reges reiterated that he continued to teach hundreds of  
4 students who remained in his class section through the end of the Winter 2022  
5 quarter without issue or disruption, despite the opportunity to join the “shadow”  
6 class.

7 ~~75.~~78. Dean Allbritton concluded the meeting by telling Professor Reges she  
8 aimed to make the best decision possible concerning the investigation, but could not  
9 guarantee a time period in which she would make that decision or a date that the  
10 investigation would conclude.

11 ~~76.~~79. Professor Reges followed through and included his dissenting land  
12 acknowledgment statement on his Spring 2022 class syllabi for Computer Science  
13 and Engineering 142 and a new C++ programming course for students who are not  
14 Computer Science majors.

15 ~~77.~~80. Director Balazinska and the Allen School again scheduled a competing  
16 section of Professor Reges’s Computer Science and Engineering 142 class for the  
17 Spring 2022 quarter.

18 ~~78.~~81. On April 21, 2022, Dean Allbritton notified Professor Reges she  
19 intended to proceed with formal charges against him.

20 ~~79.~~82. Dean Allbritton also told Professor Reges she would convene a special  
21 investigating committee to “look into this matter” under University Faculty Code

1 Section 25-71.D.3 and that she was in the process of selecting the members of the  
2 committee.

3 ~~80.83.~~ On May 19, 2022, Dean Allbritton told Professor Reges she was still  
4 “in the process of assembling the committee.”

5 ~~81.84.~~ On June 9, 2022, Dean Allbritton told Professor Reges that the  
6 “process of assembling the committee has taken some time,” that the University has  
7 “identified potential members” of the committee, and it is “in the process of  
8 gathering their acceptance[s] to serve on the committee.”

9 ~~85. As of the date of this filing~~ By July 11, 2022, Dean Allbritton ~~has~~  
10 ~~provided~~ had identified three faculty members to serve on the special investigating  
11 committee.

12 86. On July 11, 2022, Dean Allbritton formally charged the special  
13 investigating committee to begin its investigation of Professor Reges. The charge  
14 letter was based solely upon Professor Reges’s dissenting land acknowledgment  
15 statement and, at most, five written complaints from faculty, staff, and students  
16 reacting to it. Dean Allbritton described the charge letter to the special  
17 investigating committee as “confidential” and did not provide a copy to Professor  
18 Reges at that time.

19 87. Professor Reges commenced this lawsuit on July 13, 2022.

20 88. On August 25, 2022, Dean Allbritton told Professor Reges that the  
21 special investigating committee’s activities “have been placed on hold,” without  
22 providing a reason.

89. When Professor Reges asked Dean Allbritton for her reason for pausing the special investigating committee's work, she declined to provide one.

90. On September 28, 2022, the senior director of human resources wrote to the members of the special investigating committee, copying Dean Allbritton, to inform them that the investigation was no longer on hold and to ask them to report orally to the Dean as soon as possible.

91. Neither Dean Allbritton nor any other University administrator informed Professor Reges that the special investigating committee was resuming its investigation of him.

***Defendants Continue to Threaten Professor Reges with ~~neither the written charges~~ Disciplinary Action for His Inclusion of the Dissenting Land Acknowledgment Statement in His Syllabus.***

92. On June 13, 2023, eleven months after the investigation into Professor Reges began, Dean Allbritton wrote to inform him of the investigation's conclusion and to notify him of "the determinations made as a result of that process."

93. Dean Allbritton's letter claims that Professor Reges's dissenting land acknowledgment statement "created an immediate and significant disruption to the University teaching environment." To support that conclusion, Dean Allbritton vaguely cites "numerous student and staff complaints," without providing the number of complaints.

94. Dean Allbritton wrote that she would not impose further sanctions, but "if [Professor Reges] include[s] this statement in the future, and if that inclusion leads to further disruption, I will have no option but to . . . view that as an



1 intentional violation of Executive Order 31, as well as Section 24-33 of the Faculty  
2 Code.”

3 95. Dean Allbritton’s reference to “disruption” means that as little as a  
4 single complaint from a student or staff member about the content or viewpoint of  
5 Professor Reges’s dissenting land acknowledgment statement could be enough to  
6 resume the disciplinary ~~committee will consider, nor~~ process.

7 ~~82.~~96. Dean Allbritton, in her letter, claimed Professor Reges’s dissenting  
8 land acknowledgment statement caused complaints and believes the statement “will  
9 likely continue to do so when included in a purely academic setting, such as on a  
10 syllabus or in connection with ~~proposed dates for that disciplinary proceeding.~~the  
11 teaching of computer science courses.”

12 97. The only way Professor Reges can avoid further adverse employment  
13 action is to remove his dissenting land acknowledgment statement from his syllabi.

14 ~~83.~~98. As with the Winter 2022 quarter, Professor Reges taught his Spring  
15 2022, Fall 2022, Winter 2023, and Spring 2023 classes without ~~incident through the~~  
16 ~~end of the quarter on June 10, 2022~~a single in-class disruption.

17 ~~84.~~99. Professor Reges received positive student reviews for the Spring 2022  
18 ~~quarter, Fall 2022, Winter 2023, and Spring 2023 quarters, including in response to~~  
19 the question of whether students feel welcomed and respected in his class.

20 ~~85.~~100. Professor Reges was and remains able to teach his ~~class~~classes  
21 notwithstanding his decision to challenge the University’s land acknowledgment  
22 statement by including a dissenting statement on his syllabus.

23 AMENDED

24 COMPLAINT – Page 21

FOUNDATION FOR INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS AND EXPRESSION  
~~700 Pennsylvania Ave. SE~~ 510 Walnut Street, Suite 340 ~~1250~~  
~~Washington, DC 20003~~  
Philadelphia, PA 19106  
Tel: (215) 717-3473

~~86.~~101. Professor Reges is scheduled to teach Computer Science and Engineering 143 again during the Fall ~~2022, Winter 2023, and Spring 2023~~ quarters. He is also scheduled to teach the C++ programming course for students who are not Computer Science majors during the Winter 2023 quarter. This is the lightest teaching load Professor Reges has ever been assigned. 2023 and Spring 2024 quarters.

~~87.~~102. Professor Reges intends to continue to exercise his expressive right to challenge the University's land acknowledgment by including his dissenting land acknowledgment statement on his Fall ~~2022~~2023, Winter ~~2023~~2024, and Spring ~~2023~~2024 syllabi.

**Defendants Withheld Professor Reges's 2022-23 Salary Increase During the Pendency of Their Disciplinary Process Against Him.**

103. On June 7, 2022, Dean Allbritton informed Defendant Balazinska and other College of Engineering directors and chairs that President Cauce and the University board had authorized a 3.25 percent "merit increase" to eligible faculty members' salaries, effective September 1, 2022.

104. Defendants deemed Professor Reges eligible for the merit increase. However, Defendants held his merit increase "in abeyance" during the pendency of the Faculty Code 25-71 disciplinary process.

105. Before Dean Allbritton's June 13, 2023 letter to Professor Reges closing the disciplinary process, no University administrator informed Professor Reges that

1 he was approved for a merit increase or that the University withheld it during the  
2 pendency of the disciplinary process.

3 106. Dean Allbritton's letter informed Professor Reges that the University  
4 held his merit increase in abeyance, automatically, in accordance with University  
5 policy. However, Defendants are unable to identify any memorialization of that  
6 policy. Neither President Cauce's authorization letter nor the University's Office of  
7 Planning and Budgeting Merit Process Guide website capture it or identify a  
8 relevant policy document.

9 107. Rather, Dean Allbritton's letter of June 13, 2023, simply informed  
10 Professor Reges that his merit "will be reinstated" and he would receive the merit  
11 increase that had been withheld.

12 108. Upon information and belief, Professor Reges received a portion of his  
13 2022–23 merit pay increase on July 21, 2023.

14 109. To date, no University administrator has informed Professor Reges of  
15 when he would receive his 2022–23 merit increase, or whether it would be provided  
16 with interest.

17 ***Defendants' Actions Deprived Professor Reges of His Rights, Causing***  
18 ***Financial, Emotional, and Reputational Damage.***

19 ~~88-110.~~ As a direct and proximate cause of Defendants' actions,  
20 Professor Reges has suffered irreparable injury, including being deprived of his  
21 constitutional rights to freedom of speech and due process.

1 ~~89.~~111. Defendants' actions—creating a “shadow” class and mounting a  
 2 protracted investigation, ~~which carries~~ that carried the threat of termination, and  
 3 issuing a threat of further punishment if Professor Reges continues to engage in  
 4 similar protected speech—constitute adverse actions that are “reasonably likely to  
 5 deter” a reasonable employee from engaging in protected activity under the First  
 6 Amendment. *Coszalter v. City of Salem*, 320 F.3d 968, 976 (9th Cir. 2003); *see also*  
 7 *Levin v. Harleston*, 966 F.2d 85, 88–89 (2d Cir. 1992).

8 112. Because of Defendants' disciplinary process, Defendants withheld  
 9 Professor Reges's 2022–23 3.25% merit pay increase.

10 ~~90.~~113. Defendants' adoption and enforcement of overbroad policies  
 11 restricting faculty speech rights have caused Professor Reges and other University  
 12 of Washington faculty and students not before this Court irreparable harm because  
 13 the prohibition on “unacceptable” and “inappropriate” expression covers a broad  
 14 universe of constitutionally protected expression judged in relation to its *legitimate*  
 15 sweep—actionable harassment or retaliation, as properly legally defined. The policy  
 16 chills both Professor Reges and other faculty from exercising their right to engage in  
 17 expression on matters of public concern.

18 ~~91.~~114. The terms “unacceptable” and “inappropriate” as included in the  
 19 policy are undefined and carry no reasonably objective plain meaning, and are  
 20 therefore impermissibly vague.

21 ~~92.~~115. Defendants' ~~disciplinary investigation into~~ threat of future  
 22 enforcement of University policies against Professor Reges presents an ongoing

23 AMENDED

24 COMPLAINT – Page 24

FOUNDATION FOR INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS AND EXPRESSION  
~~700 Pennsylvania Ave. SE~~ 510 Walnut Street, Suite ~~340~~1250  
~~Washington, DC 20003~~  
Philadelphia, PA 19106  
 Tel: (215) 717-3473

injury, especially viewed in light of their recent enforcement of those policies  
against him, because it creates a continuing risk of tarnishing Professor Reges's  
 professional reputation and includes the threat of punishment, up to and including  
 termination, which would cause him additional financial, emotional, and  
 reputational harm.

~~93-116.~~ 116. Professor Reges has experienced damages to his reputation and  
 significant emotional distress as a result of Defendants' unconstitutional actions.  
 The ongoing ~~investigation into his protected speech, and~~ threat of  
~~termination,~~ future enforcement of University policies leaves Professor Reges in an  
 uncomfortable and untenable limbo, both professionally and personally. While he  
 remains employed, administrators have effectively isolated him from the  
 community in which he has worked for 18 years, causing him significant emotional  
 distress.

**FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**  
**Violation of Plaintiff's First Amendment Rights**  
**(Against All Individual-Capacity Defendants)**

~~94-117.~~ 117. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference each and every  
 allegation set forth in the preceding paragraphs of this Complaint.

~~95-118.~~ 118. It is clearly established under the First Amendment that  
 "viewpoint discrimination is . . . an egregious form of content discrimination. The  
 government must abstain from regulating speech when the specific motivating  
 ideology or the opinion or the perspective of the speaker is the rationale for the

1 restriction.” *Rosenberger v. Rector & Visitors of Univ. of Va.*, 515 U.S. 819, 829  
 2 (1995).

3 ~~96.~~119. It is also clearly established that “teaching and academic writing  
 4 that are performed ‘pursuant to the official duties’ of a teacher and professor” are  
 5 constitutionally protected expression if they involve matters of public concern and  
 6 the professor’s First Amendment interests outweigh the university’s need for  
 7 efficiency as an employer. *Demers v. Austin*, 746 F.3d 402, 412 (9th Cir. 2014).

8 ~~97.~~120. The University of Washington recognizes professors’ clearly  
 9 established right “to discuss all relevant matters in teaching” in its own policies.  
 10 University Faculty Code Section 24-33, last revised Jan. 9, 2014, - [https://www.  
 11 washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/FCG/FCCH24.html#:~:text=Academic%20freedom%20is%20the%20freedom,shared%20governance%20and%20the%20general](https://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/FCG/FCCH24.html#:~:text=Academic%20freedom%20is%20the%20freedom,shared%20governance%20and%20the%20general).

13 ~~98.~~121. Faculty at colleges and universities construct their syllabi and  
 14 course content to both instruct and challenge students to consider diverse  
 15 viewpoints—these are integral parts of teaching.

16 ~~99.~~122. By inviting faculty to include land acknowledgment statements  
 17 on their syllabi, the Allen School implicitly recognizes that speech about the history  
 18 of the University of Washington’s land (and competing moral or legal claims to it)  
 19 falls within the permissible faculty uses of syllabi.

20 ~~100.~~123. Professor Reges challenged his students and fellow faculty to  
 21 think about the utility and performative nature of land acknowledgment statements  
 22 by including his own land acknowledgment statement on his syllabus.

23 AMENDED

COMPLAINT – Page 26

FOUNDATION FOR INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS AND EXPRESSION  
~~700 Pennsylvania Ave. SE~~ 510 Walnut Street, Suite ~~340~~1250  
~~Washington, DC 20003~~  
Philadelphia, PA 19106  
 Tel: (215) 717-3473

1 ~~101.~~124. Professor Reges's land acknowledgment statement on his  
 2 syllabus constitutes expression protected by the First Amendment, including the  
 3 right to academic freedom.

4 ~~102.~~125. Professor Reges's land acknowledgment statement did not  
 5 interfere with his duties as a lecturer at the University. He continued to instruct  
 6 hundreds of students in his computer science class section, and recently led  
 7 students to a win in a coding competition.

8 ~~103.~~126. Professor Reges expressed his view on land acknowledgment  
 9 statements to his students, at the University's invitation, in the course of his  
 10 teaching.

11 ~~104.~~127. Defendants discriminated against Professor Reges on the basis  
 12 of viewpoint when they required him to repeat only the University's institutional  
 13 viewpoint, or to remain silent on this controversial public issue.

14 ~~105.~~128. Defendants further discriminated against Professor Reges on  
 15 the basis of viewpoint when they disciplined him because he included a statement  
 16 on his syllabus that expressed a view the University and its administrators did not  
 17 like, and which Defendant Balazinska characterized as "offensive" and  
 18 "inappropriate."

19 ~~106.~~129. As described above, Defendant Balazinska created a "shadow"  
 20 class section of Professor Reges's Computer Science and Engineering 143 course and  
 21 Defendants Balazinska, Grossman, and Allbritton are ~~pursuing an investigation~~  
 22 ~~into Reges~~ likely to pursue additional disciplinary action against Reges that carries

23 AMENDED

COMPLAINT – Page 27

FOUNDATION FOR INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS AND EXPRESSION  
~~700 Pennsylvania Ave. SE~~ 510 Walnut Street, Suite ~~340~~1250  
~~Washington, DC 20003~~  
Philadelphia, PA 19106  
 Tel: (215) 717-3473

with it the threat of termination. ~~Defendants thus unconstitutionally took~~ if he  
continues to use his dissenting land acknowledgment statement on his syllabus.  
Defendants' actions would chill a ~~calculated and adverse employment action against~~  
~~Reges~~ person of ordinary firmness from engaging in ~~retaliation for his~~ further  
protected speech activity. See ~~Demers, 746~~ Canatella v. California, 304 F.3d at 406-  
07; Levin, 966 F.2d at 88, 843, 853 (9th Cir. 2002).

130. Defendants further discriminated against Professor Reges's speech by  
withholding the merit increase to his salary during the pendency of their  
disciplinary process against him for his dissenting land acknowledgment statement.

~~107.~~ 131. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' viewpoint-  
discriminatory actions, Professor Reges has suffered irreparable injury, including  
being deprived of his constitutional right to free expression.

~~108.~~ 132. Professor Reges has no adequate legal, administrative, or other  
remedy by which to prevent or minimize the continuing irreparable harm to his  
First Amendment rights.

~~109.~~ 133. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' actions,  
Professor Reges has suffered emotional distress and injury to his reputation. The  
University has isolated him from the campus and departmental communities,  
placed his livelihood in jeopardy, and ~~has~~ left the threat of termination hanging  
over his head for ~~months~~ nearly a year. Dean Allbritton's letter dated June 13, 2023,  
threatens future discipline, up to and including termination, should Professor Reges  
continue to include his dissenting land acknowledgment in future course syllabi.

AMENDED

COMPLAINT – Page 28

FOUNDATION FOR INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS AND EXPRESSION  
~~700 Pennsylvania Ave. SE~~ 510 Walnut Street, Suite 340 1250  
Washington, DC 20003  
Philadelphia, PA 19106  
Tel: (215) 717-3473



1 ~~110.~~134. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' actions  
 2 described above, Professor Reges was and continues to be deprived of his  
 3 constitutional rights. As a legal consequence of Defendants' violation of Plaintiff's  
 4 First Amendment rights, which are irreparable injuries *per se*, Professor Reges is  
 5 entitled to compensatory damages and the reasonable costs of this lawsuit,  
 6 including reasonable attorneys' fees. Professor Reges is seeking monetary damages  
 7 against Defendants Balazinska, Grossman, and Allbritton in their individual  
 8 capacities.

9 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**  
 10 **First Amendment Retaliation Under 42 U.S.C. § 1983**  
 11 **(Against All Individual-Capacity Defendants)**

12 ~~111.~~135. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference each and every  
 13 allegation set forth in the preceding paragraphs of this Complaint.

14 ~~112.~~136. It is clearly established under the First Amendment that "a  
 15 state cannot condition public employment on a basis that infringes the employee's  
 16 constitutionally protected interest in freedom of expression." *Connick v. Myers*, 461  
 17 U.S. 138, 142 (1983).

18 ~~113.~~137. As described above, Defendant Balazinska created a "shadow"  
 19 class section of Professor Reges's Computer Science and Engineering 143 course, in  
 20 direct response to his constitutionally protected land acknowledgment statement.

21 ~~114.~~138. As described above, Defendants Balazinska, Grossman, and  
 22 Allbritton ~~investigated Professor Reges~~ initiated, supported, and oversaw a  
disciplinary investigation into Professor Reges and threatened him with future

1 sanction for allegedly violating University policy based on his constitutionally  
2 protected land acknowledgment statement.

3 ~~115~~.139. By creating the “shadow” class section and investigating  
4 Professor Reges for his protected speech, Defendants unconstitutionally took a  
5 calculated adverse employment action against Professor Reges in retaliation for his  
6 protected speech. *See Pickering v. Bd. of Educ.*, 391 U.S. 563 (1968); *Demers*, 746  
7 F.3d at 406; *Levin*, 966 F.2d at 88.

8 ~~116~~.140. Defendants Balazinska, Grossman, and Allbritton violated  
9 Professor Reges’s clearly established First Amendment rights as a university  
10 professor by disciplining him for expressing a viewpoint in the course of his teaching  
11 that dissented from the University’s prescribed viewpoint on a controversial public  
12 issue.

13 141. Defendants further retaliated against Professor Reges by withholding  
14 his 2022–23 salary increase during the pendency of their disciplinary process.

15 ~~117~~.142. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants’ actions as  
16 described above, Professor Reges was and continues to be deprived of his  
17 constitutional rights. As a result of Defendants’ violation of Plaintiff’s First  
18 Amendment rights, which are irreparable injuries *per se*, he is entitled to  
19 compensatory damages and the reasonable costs of this lawsuit, including  
20 reasonable attorneys’ fees.

**THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**  
**First Amendment Retaliation Under 42 U.S.C. § 1983**  
**(Against All Defendants in Their Official Capacities)**

~~118.~~143. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference each and every allegation set forth in the preceding paragraphs of this Complaint.

~~119.~~144. As described above, Defendants Balazinska, Grossman, and Allbritton created a “shadow” class section of Professor Reges’s Computer Science and Engineering 143 course in reaction to his constitutionally protected land acknowledgment statement. In doing so, Defendants unconstitutionally took adverse employment action against Professor Reges in retaliation for his protected speech. *See Pickering v. Bd. of Educ.*, 391 U.S. 563 (1968); *Demers*, 746 F.3d at 406; *Levin*, 966 F.2d at 88.

~~120.~~145. Defendants Balazinska, Grossman, and Allbritton ~~are~~ also unconstitutionally ~~taking~~engaged in adverse employment action against Professor Reges by investigating him, threatening future discipline against him, and withholding his 2022–23 salary increase because his constitutionally protected land acknowledgment statement allegedly violated a vague and overbroad University policy.

~~121.~~146. Professor Reges has no adequate legal, administrative, or other remedy by which to prevent or minimize the continuing irreparable harm to his First Amendment rights.

~~122.~~147. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants’ actions as described above, Professor Reges was and continues to be deprived of his

1 constitutional rights. As a result of Defendants' violations of Plaintiff's First  
 2 Amendment rights, which are irreparable injuries *per se*, Professor Reges is entitled  
 3 to injunctive relief, including but not limited to mandating that Defendants cease  
 4 their ~~investigation into~~ threat of future discipline against Professor Reges for his  
 5 protected speech.

6 ~~123.~~ 148. Professor Reges is also entitled to a permanent injunction  
 7 against Defendants creating "shadow" class sections in retaliation for his protected  
 8 expression. Professor Reges is further entitled to a declaration that Defendants'  
 9 investigating him because of his land acknowledgment statement and creating ~~of~~ a  
 10 "shadow" section of his course were unlawful retaliation for his protected  
 11 expression.

12 149. Defendant Reges is also entitled to a permanent injunction against  
 13 Defendants withholding any unpaid portion of his 2022–23 merit increase or future  
 14 salary increases because of any disciplinary process initiated due to his dissenting  
 15 land acknowledgment statement.

16 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**  
 17 **Facial Overbreadth Challenge to Executive Order 31**  
 18 **(Against President Cauce in Her Official Capacity)**

19 ~~124.~~ 150. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference each and every  
 20 allegation set forth in the preceding paragraphs of this Complaint.

21 ~~125.~~ 151. A regulation violates the First Amendment for overbreadth if "a  
 22 substantial number of its applications are unconstitutional, judged in relation to the

statute's plainly legitimate sweep." *United States v. Stevens*, 559 U.S. 460, 473 (2010) (quotations and citations omitted).

~~126-152.~~ Under University of Washington Executive Order 31, "the University retains the authority to discipline or take appropriate corrective action for any conduct that is deemed *unacceptable or inappropriate, regardless of whether the conduct rises to the level of unlawful discrimination, harassment, or retaliation.*" (Emphasis added).

~~127-153.~~ Executive Order 31 is unconstitutional on its face because it results in a substantial number of unconstitutional applications, allowing the University and its administrators to discipline faculty like Professor Reges for speech that is protected by the First Amendment, but expresses a viewpoint that the University wishes to suppress.

~~128-154.~~ For example, the policy would support discipline against a student or faculty member who, during a meeting, made a single offhand remark deemed "inappropriate," even if that remark was not harassing, discriminatory, or targeted at any individual. It would also support discipline against a student or faculty member who posted an "unacceptable" tweet criticizing the university president or another official for their position on a public issue.

~~129-155.~~ The policy's legitimate sweep prohibits discrimination, harassment, and retaliation, as properly defined by law, which are unprotected by the First Amendment. *See, e.g., Davis v. Monroe Cnty. Bd. of Educ.*, 526 U.S. 629, 651 (1999) (defining actionable harassment in the K-12 context as conduct that is

AMENDED

COMPLAINT – Page 33

FOUNDATION FOR INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS AND EXPRESSION  
~~700 Pennsylvania Ave. SE~~ 510 Walnut Street, Suite 340  
 1250 Washington, DC 20003  
 Philadelphia, PA 19106  
 Tel: (215) 717-3473

1 “so *severe, pervasive, and objectively* offensive, and that so undermines and detracts  
 2 from the victims’ educational experience, that the victim students are effectively  
 3 denied equal access to an institution’s resources and opportunities”<sup>130</sup> (emphasis  
 4 added<sup>131</sup>)).

5 <sup>130</sup>~~130~~.<sup>156</sup> But by permitting “discipline” and “corrective action” against  
 6 those whose speech University administrators deem “unacceptable” or “inappropri-  
 7 ate,” even when it does not meet the legal definition of discrimination, harassment,  
 8 or retaliation, Executive Order 31 permits a broad range of unconstitutional  
 9 applications in violation of the First Amendment, as described above.

10 <sup>131</sup>~~131~~.<sup>157</sup> As a direct and proximate result of Executive Order 31, speakers  
 11 in the University community, including Professor Reges, have suffered irreparable  
 12 injury, including being deprived of their constitutional rights to free expression.  
 13 *Broadrick v. Oklahoma*, 413 U.S. 601, 611–12 (1973).

14 <sup>132</sup>~~132~~.<sup>158</sup> Professor Reges has no adequate legal, administrative, or other  
 15 remedy by which to prevent or minimize the continuing harm to his First  
 16 Amendment rights.

17 <sup>133</sup>~~133~~.<sup>159</sup> Without declaratory and injunctive relief from this Court, the  
 18 University’s unconstitutional actions will continue, and Professor Reges and other  
 19 speakers in the University community will suffer irreparable harm indefinitely.

20 <sup>134</sup>~~134~~.<sup>160</sup> As a consequence of the University and President Cauce’s  
 21 violation of Professor Reges’s and all University of Washington students’ and  
 22 faculty members’ First Amendment rights, Professor Reges is entitled to declaratory

23 AMENDED

COMPLAINT – Page 34

FOUNDATION FOR INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS AND EXPRESSION  
~~700 Pennsylvania Ave. SE~~ 510 Walnut Street, Suite ~~340~~ 1250  
~~Washington, DC 20003~~  
Philadelphia, PA 19106  
 Tel: (215) 717-3473

1 and injunctive relief declaring Executive Order 31 unconstitutional and enjoining  
2 its enforcement.

3 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**  
4 **Facial Vagueness Challenge to Executive Order 31**  
5 **(Against President Cauce in Her Official Capacity)**

6 ~~135.~~161. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference each and every  
7 allegation set forth in the preceding paragraphs of this Complaint.

8 ~~136.~~162. A regulation violates the Due Process clause of the Fourteenth  
9 Amendment for vagueness if a person of ordinary intelligence cannot distinguish  
10 between permissible and prohibited conduct, and when there are no explicit stan-  
11 dards to prevent arbitrary and capricious application. *Grayned v. City of Rockford*,  
12 408 U.S. 104, 108 (1972); *Tucson Woman's Clinic v. Eden*, 379 F.3d 531, 555 (9th  
Cir. 2004).

13 ~~137.~~163. Under Executive Order 31, “the University retains the authority  
14 to discipline or take appropriate corrective action for any conduct that is deemed  
15 *unacceptable or inappropriate, regardless of whether the conduct rises to the level of*  
16 *unlawful discrimination, harassment, or retaliation.*” (Emphasis added).

17 ~~138.~~164. Executive Order 31 does not define “unacceptable” or  
18 “inappropriate,” and those terms do not carry with them any reasonably objective  
19 plain meaning.

20 ~~139.~~165. Executive Order 31 is unconstitutional on its face because it is  
21 so vague as to provide no basis for clear and consistent application.

1 ~~140.~~166. For example, Director Balazinska could not even confirm that  
 2 Professor Reges could safely include the University's *own* land acknowledgment  
 3 statement on his syllabus because if students complain that could mean Professor  
 4 Reges violated the policy.

5 ~~141.~~167. Executive Order 31 is unconstitutional on its face because it is  
 6 so vague that it authorizes arbitrary, capricious, and viewpoint-discriminatory  
 7 application, and fails to provide people of ordinary intelligence a reasonable oppor-  
 8 tunity to understand what expression is "unacceptable" or "inappropriate."

9 ~~142.~~168. The denial of constitutional rights is an irreparable injury *per*  
 10 *se*, and entitles the Plaintiff to injunctive relief. *Elrod v. Burns*, 427 U.S. 347, 373  
 11 (1976).

12 ~~143.~~169. Professor Reges has no adequate legal, administrative, or other  
 13 remedy by which to prevent or minimize the continuing irreparable harm to his  
 14 rights under the First and Fourteenth Amendments.

15 ~~144.~~170. Without declaratory and injunctive relief from this Court, the  
 16 University's unconstitutional actions will continue, and Professor Reges and other  
 17 speakers in the University community will suffer irreparable harm indefinitely.

18 ~~145.~~171. As a consequence of the University's and Defendant Cauce's  
 19 violation of Professor Reges's First and Fourteenth Amendment rights, Professor  
 20 Reges is entitled to declaratory and injunctive relief declaring Executive Order 31  
 21 unconstitutional and enjoining its enforcement.



**PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, Professor Reges respectfully requests that this Court enter judgment against Defendants and issue the following forms of relief:

A. Compensatory damages against the individual-capacity Defendants in an amount to be determined by the ~~Court~~fact-finder to compensate Professor Reges for their interference with his rights under the U.S. Constitution and for the significant emotional distress and reputational harm he has experienced;

B. Any remaining back pay with interest to compensate Professor Reges for his withheld 2022–23 merit pay increase that has not been provided as of the date of this filing;

~~B.C.~~ An injunction prohibiting Defendants from continuing to investigate Professor Reges for his constitutionally pursuing any investigation or disciplinary action on the basis of Professor Reges’s protected speech on dissenting land acknowledgment statement in his syllabus course syllabi;

~~C.D.~~ An injunction against Defendants from creating future “shadow” sections of Professor Reges’s classes in retaliation for his constitutionally protected speech;

E. An injunction prohibiting Defendants from withholding future salary increases to Professor Reges because of any investigations or other disciplinary action arising from his ongoing or future inclusion of his dissenting land acknowledgment statement in his syllabus;

D.F. An injunction against Defendants from enforcing Executive Order 31 and any other vague, overbroad, or viewpoint discriminatory policy that prevents Professor Reges from including his land acknowledgment statement on his syllabus;

E.G. A declaration that Defendants' disciplinary investigation into Professor Reges and threat of future enforcement against him for his constitutionally protected speech on his syllabus violates the First Amendment;

F.H. A declaration that Defendants' creating "shadow" sections of Professor Reges's classes violates the First Amendment;

G.I. A declaration that Executive Order 31 is unconstitutionally vague and overbroad;

H.J. Attorneys' fees and costs under 42 U.S.C. § 1988 and other applicable law; and

I.K. All further legal and equitable relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

### DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

In compliance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 38, Plaintiff demands a trial by jury on all issues so triable.

DATED: ~~July 13, 2022~~ August 1, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Robert A. Bouvatte  
ROBERT A. BOUVATTE, JR.  
WA Bar No. 50220  
ROBERT A. BOUVATTE, PLLC  
P.O. Box 14185

AMENDED  
COMPLAINT – Page 38

FOUNDATION FOR INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS AND EXPRESSION  
~~700 Pennsylvania Ave. SE~~ 510 Walnut Street, Suite ~~340~~ 1250  
~~Washington, DC 20003~~  
Philadelphia, PA 19106  
Tel: (215) 717-3473

Tumwater, WA 98511  
Tel: (904) 505-3175 (564) 999-4005  
bob@rbouvattepllc.com

JAMES M. DIAZ\*  
VT Bar No. 5014  
FOUNDATION FOR INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS  
AND EXPRESSION  
510 Walnut Street  
Suite 1250  
Philadelphia, PA 19106  
Tel: (215) 717-3473  
jay.diaz@thefire.org

GABRIEL WALTERS\*  
DC Bar No. 1019272

JOSHUA T. BLEISCH\*  
IN Bar No. 35859-53

~~GABRIEL WALTERS\*~~  
~~DC Bar No. 1019272~~

FOUNDATION FOR INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS  
AND EXPRESSION  
700 Pennsylvania Avenue SE  
Suite 340  
Washington, DC 20003  
Tel: (215) 717-3473  
gabe.walters@thefire.org  
josh.bleisch@thefire.org  
~~gabe.walters@thefire.org~~

\*Admitted *Pro Hac Vice* ~~Motions Forthcoming~~

*Counsel for Plaintiff Stuart Reges*